

Complete tape recordings of most Board Meetings are available at 25 Churchill Avenue.

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2009

<u>Call to Order</u>	<p>The Board of Education of Palo Alto Unified School District held a Regular Meeting in the Board Room at 25 Churchill Avenue, Palo Alto, California. Barb Mitchell, President, called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.</p> <p>Members present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ms. Barb Mitchell, President Ms. Barbara Klausner, Vice President Ms. Melissa Baten Caswell Mr. Dana Tom Ms. Camille Townsend Mr. Chirag Krishna, Paly, Student Board Representative Mr. Phil Park, Gunn, Student Board Representative <p>Staff present:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr. Kevin Skelly, Superintendent Dr. Scott Bowers, Assistant Superintendent Ms. Ginni Davis, Assistant Superintendent Mr. Scott Laurence, Assistant Superintendent Dr. Robert Golton, Chief Business Officer Ms. Cathy Mak, Chief Business Officer Dr. Burton Cohen, Director Dr. Becki Cohn-Vargas, Director Mr. Eric Goddard, Principal Mr. Gary Prehn, Principal Ms. Susanne Scott, Principal Mr. Ryan Fletcher, Middle School Math Instructional Supervisor (IS) Ms. Becky Rea, Middle School Math IS Ms. Ellie Slack, Middle School Math IS Ms. Lucy de Anda, Teacher on Special Assignment (TOSA) Ms. Magdalena Fittoria, TOSA Ms. Staci Stoveland, TOSA Ms. Gina Brereton, Teacher, Elementary Math Adoption Committee Ms. Catherine Sullivan, Teacher, Elementary Math Adoption Committee
<u>Closed Session</u>	The Board adjourned to closed session for Employee Appointment pursuant to Government Code 54957 – Principal; and Conference with Labor Negotiator, Dr. Scott Bowers, regarding PAEA, CSEA, and Non-represented groups pursuant to Government Code 54957.6.
<u>Reconvene in Open Session</u>	The Board reconvened in regular session at 6:30 p.m. in the Board Room. Mitchell announced the Board took no action during closed session.
<u>Approval of Agenda Order</u>	MOTION: Baten Caswell moved to approve the agenda order. Tom seconded. Motion carried 5-0.
<u>Staff and Student Successes</u>	<p>Skelly recognized: the new JLS Principal, Sharon Ofek. He also discussed the swine flu issue, saying the District was working hard to keep up with the latest information. Staff were watching children for flu symptoms and taking preventative measures, such as encouraging hand washing. The District would take action only under the direction of the Santa Clara County Health Department. Skelly also mentioned a number of conferences attended by senior staff.</p> <p>Golton presented a construction update, including the Paly pool, Gunn track, Gunn softball field, Gunn baseball field, Gunn IA building, Gunn pool, Bond Oversight Committee site visit, upcoming Committee reporting, time spent on pre-construction planning, and El Camino field bidding process and results.</p>
<u>Information</u> Student Board Representative Reports	<p>Mitchell noted that the Board had dined with a group of students before this meeting, and they had a good discussion about student concerns and questions.</p> <p>Phil Park, of Gunn, discussed: the dinner with the Board, Key Club fundraiser, ASB elections, and Prom.</p>

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2009

	<p>Chirag Krishna, of Paly, discussed ASB elections, AP registration, Prom, Spring Festival on Memorial Day weekend, and the dinner with the Board.</p>
<p><u>Information</u> Superintendent's Report</p>	<p>Skelly recognized students qualifying for the Math Olympiad; honors received by the Paly Robotics Team; Sasha Targ, who was a finalist for the USA Biology Olympiad; Susan Charles for defending her dissertation; and Scott Laurence for being named Superintendent at the San Mateo Union High School District.</p>
<p><u>Action</u> Approval of Consent Calendar</p>	<p>MOTION: Baten Caswell moved to approve Certificated and Classified Personnel actions; minutes from the special meeting held on April 14, 2008; and Resolutions 2008-09.16, Day and Week of the Teacher, and 2008-09.17, Classified Employees' Week. Klausner seconded. Motion carried 5-0.</p>
<p><u>Action</u> Adoption of Middle School Mathematics Instructional Materials</p>	<p>Cohen recapped the recommendation to the Board.</p> <p>Board member comments included appreciation for the presentation given at the prior meeting, lack of fundamental differences between the current books and the proposed ones, availability of online tools, pricing, training, challenges, Special Education Steering Committee involvement in the adoption process, the supporting role of textbooks for the teachers' programs, availability of <i>Connected Mathematics</i> and its purchase as a supplement for Grades 6 and 8, and continued use of existing materials created by teachers.</p> <p>Xenia Hammer, the parent representative on the Middle School Math Adoption Committee voiced her appreciation for the process, saying one topic of discussion was how the main text would be used with the supplemental text. She said there was a great deal of parent involvement in the review process, and she strongly supported the selection.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p>Mandy Lowell thanked the District for the clear way the adoption was handled, including frequent updates and the inclusion of a high school teacher and principals. She believed the core texts appeared to be mainstream and balanced, and she had confidence in the decision made by the Committee. She also asked if <i>Connected Math</i> was on the state adopted list and which funds would be used for the purchase.</p> <p>Cohen said <i>Connected Math</i> was not on the state adopted list, and local funds would be used for the purchase.</p> <p>MOTION: Townsend moved to adopt the following 6-8 basic and supplemental materials:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Holt – <i>California Mathematics: Course 1, Course 2, Algebra I</i> (grades 6-8 basic)• Key Curriculum Press – <i>Discovering Algebra: An Investigative Approach CA Edition</i> (grade 8 supplemental) <p>Klausner seconded. Motion carried 5-0.</p>
<p><u>Action</u> Adoption of Elementary School Mathematics Instructional Materials</p>	<p>Mitchell applauded the talent, intelligence, and professionalism of the committee and community members while debating textbooks and noted the common commitment to growing world-class math students.</p> <p>Skelly briefly reviewed the report from the last meeting, as well as the additional information provided in the report for this meeting. A slide presentation was given, focusing on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Updates since April 14 Board discussion• History of PAUSD math adoptions• Present teaching situation• Strategic plan process• Objectives from this adoption• <i>Everyday Math (EDM)</i> is a leading math program for the top performing districts in California and the nation• K-5 math materials used by districts in 2007 PiE benchmarking study• K-5 math materials used by 21st Century Consortium members• <i>Why Everyday Math?</i>• Challenges discussed about <i>Everyday Math</i>• Principal and instructional supervisor thoughts about the adoption<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Catherine Sullivan, teacher and Committee member, strongly supported the selection of <i>EDM</i>. She described her prior experience overseas at competitive schools, saying the program provided features and materials needed to achieve great success. Some highlights are: differentiated instruction, spiraling, and assessments. She said these highlights supported teachers in their efforts to help all students succeed.○ Gina Brereton, teacher and Committee member, said she taught <i>EDM</i> in New York to special needs students in both first and second grade. Lessons were open-ended enough to allow children to work at their individual levels. Children were encouraged to use a variety of manipulatives and to choose the ones that were right for them. There is a rich discussion after each lesson. She said she currently utilized spiraling and was glad it was embedded in <i>EDM</i>. She was very impressed with the program and had observed that every child was engaged and successful.○ Becky Rea, Instructional Supervisor, participated in a January elementary math adoption meeting and was impressed with the thoroughness of the discussion of the materials. Regarding middle school preparation, she was

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2009

certain that if the text was approved by the state, it would enable all students to meet state standards. She also felt *EDM* taught conceptual understanding.

- Ellie Slack, Instructional Supervisor, said this District did an amazing job teaching math at a variety of levels, and it was a leader in the U.S. She recognized it was important for students to be good at both computation and conceptualization. She said a committee was being set up to address the transitions? She added she was extremely impressed with the proposed professional development piece of this adoption.
 - Eric Goddard, Principal, said principals had carefully listened to community concerns and would make sure this adoption was successful. Principals were not hearing a high level of concern across the elementary schools and were in awe of the staff and Committee work going into this process. He said all the elementary principals supported this adoption.
 - Susanne Scott, Principal, said *EDM* would allow teachers to teach to students at all levels. With the professional development plan, teachers and principals would be able to start training and planning for the integration of *EDM* into the teaching of math. She understood the community would be watching teachers closely during the implementation of this process and nothing less was expected. Teachers were responsible for the delivery of instruction and would continue to support it with communication to parents, homework, etc.
- If *EDM* is adopted tonight
 - Fifth grade implementation
 - Summary

Tom asked about teachers' past experience with spiraling and how successful it was. Sullivan said spiraling was key and, with good teaching, it happened whether or not it was embedded in the program. She felt there was closure by the end of each grade. The beauty of this program was that it gave teachers an opportunity for systematic, efficient spiraling. Fittoria noted the addition of additional materials to the report, as requested at the last meeting, such as standards (Attachment 9). She said *EDM* contained units of study focused around key content areas. These lessons included reviews of prior units and previews of upcoming units, allowing teachers to assess student progress. Tom asked about the scope of calculator use in the current program by grade level and in the proposed new program. Skelly said one suggestion made was to ban calculators in grades K-2. He said this decision should be based on the professional judgment of the teachers. The goal was to help students increase conceptual understanding, especially as students moved to higher levels of math. De Anda said that calculator use was currently up to teacher discretion, with the understanding that teachers would not use them as a crutch. For example, there is a game called "Broken Calculator" that consisted of various challenges that requires students to use calculators and do math mentally. First grade, for example, reported there were about four lessons in one year involving calculators in *EDM*. Stoveland said calculators were listed as tools for games (Beat the Calculator), differentiation, ongoing practice, and more. Many times, calculator use is optional. Fittoria said it could be characterized as infrequent use.

Klausner said she was concerned about instructional time needed for *EDM*, saying lessons were intended to last 75-90 minutes, with supplementation as needed. She asked how this would fit into the teaching day. Davis said that currently about 60-90 minutes was being spent on math each day. More time would be needed with the new program, and time would become more of an area of focus. Fittoria added that with *EDM* a lot of routines, such as "Math Boxes," could be done independently during other times, such as when attendance and lunch orders are taken. De Anda clarified that the 75-90 minute recommendation included "Basic Facts" practice. Klausner noted that 75 minutes was more than a majority of teachers spent on math and asked how this would be handled. Brereton said that when she started piloting, lessons took longer because she was less familiar with the curriculum. Over time, however, both she and the students were more familiar with the program and the lessons took less time. In addition, the teaching manual said "Math Boxes" could be used the following day for assessment. Kevin Stevens, a teacher, said he has never used more than an hour for math each day in his fourth grade class, including practicing "Math Facts." Stephanie Han, a teacher, said she found that in piloting *Investigations* more time was actually needed than *EDM*. Alison Curtis, a teacher, said lesson time during *EDM* piloting was the same as her current program. Laura Lageunesse said she took a little longer with *EDM* in the beginning until she got familiar with the Teacher Edition. Klausner asked about Special Education students and English Language (EL) learners. Cohn Vargas noted there was a lot of language in *EDM*; however, there was also a lot of support, including an English Learner handbook for each class. For Special Education, there was a differentiation piece in each lesson to help teachers ensure comprehension. Klausner asked if there was specific feedback about the program from a Special Education Resource Teacher. Stoveland said the teacher had a small number of Special Education students, and worked with them individually. She found she used specific resources more. Skelly said math instruction is typically done in the classroom, so challenges for Special Education students would be formidable. It would be difficult for any set of materials to span the entire range of learning levels. Special Education would likely require supplementation. Regarding English Learners, he said it was important to teach academic language both in the classroom and as part of EL support. He said this program would be watched carefully, as with Special Education, to make sure it works. Klausner asked how non-English-speaking parents could support their children at home. Cohn-Vargas said there was a multi-lingual handbook and online content was translated into Spanish. Cohn-Vargas said the only major language she did not see in the handbook was Japanese. She noted the group most wanting translation in PAUSD was the Spanish speaking community. Klausner asked for clarification on "spiral" and whether or not *EDM* expected mastery. She also noted the National Math Advisory Panel report stating that spiraling was bad, as there was no closure or mastery. De Anda noted that spiraling was addressed in Attachment 12 of the report presented at this meeting. *EDM*'s spiraling included periodic practice of key standards throughout the year, which is different from how the Panel defined "spiraling." Klausner asked at what point there would be an expectation of mastery of a concept in *EDM*. Skelly said roughly 60% of grade 2-5 students scoring "Advanced" on the CST, with the District goal being 90%. He said that currently, if a student did not score 100% on a text, it was understood the concept would be brought back

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2009

and the student would have another chance for mastery in the future. He also said he preferred the term "scaffolding" to "spiraling" as it was more descriptive. Fittoria added there was value in adding links to the past and the future. At the beginning of a grade, for example, concepts learned in the previous grade were reviewed before moving on to more advanced concepts. Every unit ended with an assessment, and teachers could also use tools to modify these assessments. Klausner asked for feedback regarding the notion of revising grade level standards and progress reports to match guidelines set forth in *EDM*. Skelly noted that progress reports were currently hand-written. In addition, it was traditional to update progress reports following any new adoption. He said parents deserved very specific feedback on their children's progress. Cohn-Vargas added that California standards were carefully reviewed during the last adoption and were revised to be as they are now. Usually, at the end of every adoption process, the committee and TOSAs reviewed standards, identified key standards, then adapted progress reports. Electronic progress reports had been piloted this year, and would be looked at again soon. Klausner said progress reports were a good communication tool with parents. She expressed a sense of urgency in revising the standards and progress reports.

Krishna said he understood the benefit of repetition, then asked how *EDM* provided for the home-school connection. Stoveland said there were family letters at the beginning of each unit describing what would be covered, giving examples of games, and providing answer sheets. There was also a student reference book that gave further support to students. Each student would be able to access this book online as well, in addition to a tool that could read the book to the student and other features, such as a video of a process. Games played in class were also sent home as homework and were online.

Baten Caswell asked for a description of the math content area in the professional development plan. Davis said this was embedded through the professional development plan. There would also be specific additional ongoing training in different areas. Baten Caswell asked if there was a list of topics that might require more training and whether the training would be optional. Skelly said principals would be expected to coax teachers into getting further training in areas where they were not as strong. In addition, teachers would benefit a great deal from sharing effective practices with their peers. Stoveland added that in addition to professional development, *EDM* included a Teacher Reference Manual for teachers to do research independently. Baten Caswell stressed the importance of understanding mathematical concepts, because there were so many ways each concept was being taught. De Anda said the Math Network was based on this, including research of the development of student understanding of key concepts over the course of elementary school. De Anda said teachers would not only have the Teacher Reference Manual, but also the materials gathered by the Math Network. Baten Caswell asked if there had been discussion with the CAC on how the program could be adapted to Special Education students. Cohn-Vargas said this had not yet occurred, but staff was very open to it. Baten Caswell asked what percent of students were designated as "special education." Skelly said it was about 10%, but that included students with speech and language issues. Baten Caswell asked what strategies would be in place to make sure average and struggling students maintained confidence when they did not master concepts on the first exposure. De Anda said this was a challenge, and that teachers frequently assessed not only student progress, but social-emotional health. Skelly said he had heard comments from parents that *EDM* was confusing. He believed the burden was on the teacher, as this program was language-rich and required staff development. Good teachers would be needed to teach this curriculum, and principals would have to watch this. Baten Caswell said that as a parent, if her child came home confused, she would want to help him or her. She asked how these kids would be supported. De Anda said it was important to keep track of this and to determine whether or not students were meeting specific benchmarks during the school year. Baten Caswell suggested this could contribute to the achievement gap, because not all parents could help their kids. Stoveland added that the program, not just the textbook, contributed to student self-esteem. Students needed to be comfortable taking risks and learning from mistakes. In other schools, with traditional texts, students were tested at the end of each unit, then forced to move on whether or not they grasped the concepts. Fittoria said Attachment 10 in the packet reflected the importance of mastery and listed resources. She added there were a Math Intervention summer program and a Math Academy that were meant to help students who were below grade level. Baten Caswell asked when the Adoption Committee discussed the National Math Advisory report. Stoveland said it was sent out to Committee members and discussed during meetings after programs were selected to pilot. The Committee studied and discussed a lot of research, including this report. She said this research had been going on over the past few years.

Open Forum

There were no requests to speak.

Action

Adoption of Elementary School Mathematics Instructional Materials (continued)

Townsend asked if the concerns of the districts adopting, then rejecting, *EDM* were considered by the Committee. She said she contacted Princeton School District, and the person she spoke with said they were concerned about Math Facts. Other books were also adopted to fill the holes they found in *EDM*. She asked what other districts adopted in addition to *EDM*. Townsend was also told that another district felt they had made a huge mistake by including every aspect of the *EDM* program, and they were opposed to a program-locked program. Townsend asked if staff saw any holes or weaknesses in the program and if any other texts would be selected to supplement it. Stoveland said she and Stephanie Youngquist, of the Committee, had done some research and often found that districts rejecting *EDM* had reported kids learned a lot and still had good test scores; however, more ongoing teacher training and parent information nights were needed. Youngquist said she contacted eleven districts using *EDM* and all reported student success, although some chose not to readopt it. They said the program had to be implemented with fidelity, and teacher training and orientation were key. She said she had also found not all districts purchased all pieces of the program or had state standards aligned with *EDM*. Townsend asked if other texts were used to supplement *EDM*. Youngquist said Glencoe was used for advanced students in one district, and *Fast Facts* was used by others for struggling students. Stoveland said there were some issues with another district involving the transition from fifth grade to sixth, where teachers required standards algorithms only. Another district recommended

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2009

including sixth grade teachers in *EDM* training to give them a better understanding of what students would be learning. Townsend noted that one of the arguments coming from the community against *EDM* was that many algorithms were taught, and children were allowed to choose the ones they preferred rather than being told to ultimately use standard algorithms. She asked if this was how staff saw *EDM*. De Anda said specific algorithms were highlighted throughout the text to be sure they were taught. Townsend asked what supplementary materials might be used. De Anda said some teachers currently used materials that worked well for them, and it was hoped they would continue to use them where needed. Townsend asked when it would be known if the *EDM* program was successful. Skelly said the highest level of professionalism would be expected. PAUSD teachers would be expected to adhere to this new program, rather than continue with what they were currently doing. He believed teachers could be counted on to take a good look at the materials and determine what might need supplementation. Fittoria said that in fourth grade, for example, students were given frequent assessments, some timed, so teachers could assess progress. Townsend asked Skelly if the Math Committee had discussed piloting *EDM* at a school for an entire year. Skelly said this had not been discussed.

Mitchell asked if there was a common sense of the amount of time dedicated to teaching non-standard algorithms, and whether this confuses students when they face bigger problems in middle and high school. Skelly said this was discussed considerably. Teachers would determine how much time they would spend on alternative algorithms, and these algorithms would be used to enhance students' understanding of math. He also noted there was not universal agreement on what standard algorithms were. Mitchell asked how and when parents would be certain their children had mastered major concepts, saying expectations were not explicit for standard multiplication and division algorithms in the District's standards and progress reports. Cohn-Vargas said the progress reports needed to be updated to be more explicit. Baten Caswell said there was some confusion about whether the checkboxes on the progress reports meant items had been taught or mastered.

MOTION: Tom moved to extend the meeting to 11:00 p.m. Baten Caswell seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

Stoveland said that during the March Committee meeting a study group spent an hour looking at the National Math report, then reported back to the Committee. She added that a great deal of other research was considered during the process.

Public Comment

Bill Rosenberg urged the Board to adopt *EDM* saying it was not perfect, but no text was perfect. The teaching staff did a very good job and would continue to do so. He said the concept of returning to concepts, assuming kids don't learn them the first time, was not new. A formalized structure was better than what had been done in the past if there was good feedback. The purpose of calculation was understanding, not just getting the answer. He said parents might be afraid of the teaching of multiple algorithms because they did not know them, and that calculators should be used as a tool, but not as a substitute.

Zeev Wurman said he was disappointed that specifics were not presented in response to the questions asked at the last Board meeting. Staff offered no specific suggestion to resolve questions. He questioned the process used by staff.

Mandy Lowell thanked staff, teachers, and the Board for their efforts. She was glad to see standard algorithms would be taught; however, this program was at the extreme end of the pendulum and did not appear to be balanced. She asked how algorithms would be taught to a child with processing or retention issues. Students not getting concepts in class might not get help at home. She did not believe the CST scores would drop; however, students would struggle with learning crucial facts.

Stephanie Youngquist, a parent on the Elementary Math Textbook Adoption Committee, said she trusted teachers to make a good decision. She was amazed at the professionalism and thought put into this process. The teachers had excitement and energy for this program, and the more she learned about the program, the more she liked it.

Roxane Douvos said this process was not transparent and had not allowed for enough community input. She said publisher data and counter data were not verified before the Committee voted for *EDM*. She said many parents wanted focused teaching on standards only. She suggested asking for more time, as there were still a lot of questions and concerns. She thanked the Board and staff for all the time they spent answering questions.

Al Yuen, a Site Council member at Duveneck, said a lot of parents felt they could not voice their opinions during the process. He also found that some Committee members felt the same way, because it seemed that the decision had already been made and there was a sense of urgency. He also found that all fifth grade teachers had voted against *EDM*. The Committee did a good job addressing the issues; however, many issues were still being discussed. People felt as though they were either with the teachers or against them.

Vatsal Sonecha thanked the Board and staff for all the time they put into this process. He said a petition had been submitted with more than 700 signatures, suggesting this decision be delayed and that other texts be considered. Parents should have been surveyed, and yet the process was ignored, which was not fair. Education Code 60061 was violated by McGraw Hill, so it should have been disqualified from the process, and staff recommendations lack specifics.

Giselle Galper thanked staff for the polite and active discourse and said voting to approve *EDM* was a vote to reject the

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2009

National Math Panel's first and most important recommendation: no spiraling. She said experts had invested two years to develop a set of unanimous recommendations in 2008. This week three Board members, and three community members sat in on conference calls with math experts. During these calls, it was stated that spiraling contradicted the fundamental tenets of math and lead to superficial learning. Special needs students required curriculum where mastery was required when each concept was taught the first time.

Angie Ball suggested further review of why *EDM* was abandoned by some districts. She said *EDM* was used for seven years in Menlo Park, and some problems were the lack of preparation for middle school math, weak foundations, the need for a lot of supplementing, and problematic spiraling. Stanford professors said *EDM* was flawed and would not support math education for elementary students, and it failed to succeed in conceptual understanding.

Lauren Janov said Obama had said U.S. students were outperformed by their international competitors. He committed to improving math and science education, so students would move to the top in math and science in the next decade. Janov was excited by the renewed interest in math in the community and asked that a text be selected that would not hold students back. She asked that more time be taken to determine how *EDM* fits with the District's needs and with the National Math Panel's recommendations.

Robert Smith reviewed the history of math adoptions in PAUSD. He did not understand why every classroom had to use the same book. He did not believe this program was parent-friendly.

Dan Dykwel, PTA Council President, said the Council had taken no position on this issue; however, they were part of the process. While the parent selection process was not followed, the parents on the Committee did their due diligence. Community outreach along the way was not sufficient, and the number of signatures on the petition for delaying the decision was significant and should be taken seriously. Dykwel asked the Board to give parents more opportunities for input before making a decision.

Rajiv Bhateja acknowledged all the work that had gone into this process. He said one test was worth a thousand expert opinions, and suggested this program be tested. He said the question was, "Is *EDM* the best choice for our teachers and children?" There are a lot of questions being asked. He said Texas had dropped *EDM*, but no information had been reported during this process. He said this program required a lot of training, and this decision was very polarizing, then suggested the Board vote no.

Lisa Jiang thanked Committee members for their work; the Board, Superintendent, and Principals for their stewardship; and the community for its involvement. She was concerned about the adoption of this program because of the process issue, calculator use, spiraling, meeting needs of EL and special education students, home-school connection, and more. She asked how the District would train and educate parents so they could help their students at home. She asked if the Board was comfortable with voting for this program in spite of the petition, then suggested piloting other programs such as *SRA Real Math*.

Jenny Zhang thanked the Committee for its work and said she respected the opinions of parents. She did not believe the program should be approved now because of all the unanswered questions. She said the publisher had been asked to provide a list of all districts adopting then rejecting *EDM*; however, this list had not been provided. Regarding spiraling, she was concerned that children would think they did not need to worry about grasping a concept one year, because it would be brought forward again the next year. She was also concerned about mixed messages regarding calculator use.

Kurt Borgwardt, a parent Committee member, said he used to have a child attending Gideon Housner School, who was now at Duveneck. At Gideon Housner, which used *EDM*, extensive tutoring and parental involvement across the school with otherwise high-achieving children was occurring. This may have been due to lack of teacher training; however, there could be other reasons. He worked with fifth grade teachers on the Committee, who were not in favor of *EDM*. At that time, teachers felt psychological pressure to find a way to support the recommendation of *EDM*. He suggested that standards, and world class programs be considered during the next adoption process.

Jatin Parekk asked if a hybrid program had been considered, because there were many positive aspects in the program. In terms of process, he would have liked to see more interaction with the community. He also questioned some of the statistics presented.

Skelly said he had never seen a process this good; however, he realized it fell short of the community's concerns. He said it was clear that more than three parents would be needed on a committee that had so many teacher members. He noted two of the three parents started as skeptics and emerged as champions of the program. The fifth grade issue did need to be addressed, and his sense had been that fifth grade teachers would support the program if the rest of the Committee selected it. Regarding the petition, there had been a tremendous sense of interest on this, and there was a lot of respect for the choice the teachers made. He also repeated that the quality of teachers and their sense of ownership around the issues was of greater value than the text they used. He said it was important for the Board to keep this in mind when they voted. He felt *EDM* would work in this organization and that a majority of people believed in the teachers and Committee members, and were willing to support their decision. He said it was never the District's intention to run a process that did not include the community, and that Board policy needed to be changed if this process was to be changed or delayed. He said teachers

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2009

had to be asked if they would be open to doing another adoption, and they would need to be convinced that if they did this again, their decision would be honored.

MOTION: Tom moved to extend the meeting to 12:00 a.m. Townsend seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

Baten Caswell noted that everyone involved in this process really cared. She said she felt this was a very difficult decision, and she wanted to be sure the inputs supported the desired outputs. She also wanted to determine which Board decision would serve the most parents and students. She said teachers worked very hard, and they had been given a lot of new materials to digest over the past few years. She suggested stepping back and slowing down this process. This would enable more parent concerns to be addressed and allow the teachers more time to learn all the new materials they had been given over the past few years. She also noted two texts had been piloted by teachers. Gaps in this process needed to be found and filled. She said she loved the professional development piece of this program; however, the details needed to be determined before investing in it. She was worried, on the other hand, that there were still so many parent concerns. She felt as though outside research was not thoroughly done during the process and added that the Board policy did not include this. She also worried that a Yes vote would make many parents feel disenfranchised because it did not model the rigor expected from this district. The National Math Advisory report should have been discussed in depth. Although staff had best intentions to involve parents early on, it was not clear to a majority of parents that they could give input until after the Committee voted. The PTA should have been included in the process from the beginning. She felt a no vote would speak to the importance of accountability and would improve the process; however, it could also cause some teacher dissatisfaction. If a no vote did take place, it might be hard to find people to participate in the next adoption process. She also realized that if this process was to be extended, and another text was piloted, *EDM* could still be the final choice. She suggested the process be fixed and an Board discussion should occur to discuss the process breakdown, math priorities, and the future process. In addition, another program should be piloted. The middle schools have to be involved. She also suggested an independent person should manage the project, and professional development at the math content level could be started right away without an adoption. She suggested another group, such as the principals, do formalized interviews with other districts and independent research.

Tom said it was clear a lot of staff work had been done on this issue, and he respected parents on both sides of this issue. He said everyone wanted students to acquire a deep understanding of math, and this vote was on how to accomplish this. The Board had to decide whether or not it was confident staff could teach math using *EDM*. He said some concerns had been addressed, including the need for students to continue to learn math facts. He did not believe there would be an over reliance on calculators; however, he was disappointed a clear answer had not been given on the question of frequency. He was comfortable with the discussion about assuring proficiency with standard algorithms. He was troubled by how SRA was removed from the process even though members of the committee initially like it. He said this was an imperfect process, but the question was whether the problem was sufficient to warrant a delay. He felt the one concern was that by delaying the English Language Arts adoption by a year, teachers would have two years to implement *EDM* if it was adopted now. He observed that the National Math Advisory Report was not clear on what was meant by "spiraling." It seemed this term related to the number of topics introduced per year, not a particular set of materials. If students could learn the core of a new topic well enough, they could build on it in the future. It was stated by a teacher that it was hard to assume every child had mastered a concept on the first exposure, so repeated exposure is sometimes needed. He said there are also organizational issues, and having teacher support really makes a difference. It was important that those who did not support the program should state their concerns, then support the final decision; however, it was impossible to get 100% teacher support. He said the central question was whether or not the Board had confidence this program would be successful. He believed staff were capable of educating students and there was a comprehensive implementation plan, so he was confident teachers could succeed with *EDM*. His only concern was process.

Klausner acknowledged there was a perception she was an unwavering proponent of *EDM* but that this was not the case. She raised a number of questions about the program. She wanted to make sure it was a good fit for the District. Significant modifications and changes had been made, and she was comfortable in terms of the staff feedback she had heard. The changes in the process had already improved the PAUSD program. One teacher had explained that students learned more if different ways of learning the same concept were introduced to them. Klausner said differentiation was a distinguishing aspect of the program, and it was included in the District goals. Her concern was whether the higher knowledge offered by the program would get to the students. It seemed that the results of other districts using *EDM* were very mixed; however, it was crucial for her to know there were districts that were successful with the program. She also talked to a number of representatives with districts that had rejected the program. She asked for definitive data showing *EDM* was a failure, but there was no decline in test scores, and in some cases the number of *EDM* students taking the highest level math in the secondary schools actually went up. She also talked with districts that considered *EDM*, but made other choices, included Bridgewater-Raritan and Scarsdale. Every district had to assess its own needs and make the best choice for its teachers, students, and parents. In the end, Klausner felt the process in terms of looking at the materials was thorough, and she was confident in the decision of the Committee. By voting no now, positive momentum that started in 2007 for professional development for elementary math might be lost along with the chance to use the new materials as the focus for professional development for two full years. She said there was plenty of room for improvement of this process, and she was concerned about the sense of unhappiness in the community. She realized not everyone could be happy, but she looked forward to continuing to work on the process issue. This did not affect the ultimate outcome in terms of what would work for students. She said she hoped that after this vote, everyone could move forward together, whatever the result.

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2009

MOTION: Townsend moved to extend the meeting to 12:30 a.m. Tom seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

Townsend said she appreciated the earlier public comment that whatever the text, adjustments could be made, such as addition of tutors, additional parent help, etc. She felt the Board was being asked to throw out the current text that teachers seemed to like. She would be concerned if a new program was brought in and teachers were forced to use it when there were still unanswered questions. She did not see materials that would fill the holes, including the support of Special Education students, and she was opposed to taking risks and experimenting on students. She suggested asking a school to use *EDM* for a year, as she did not believe due diligence had been done. She was also concerned about itinerant students, as they could leave the District and not know standard algorithms. She felt that adopting this text without answers to these issues was reckless. She said there was no question teachers had the respect of the community, but there was no support for parents in this program. This process was imperfect, although the Board had promised transparency to the community. She felt that if this was such a great program, enthusiasm should not be lost if the decision was postponed for a year while more information was gathered. She then asked if the Board passed this program, when all the unanswered questions would be answered to give the community some certainty on what to expect. Regarding professional development, she was unsure as to whether the training would be strictly on use of the text, or on the teaching of math. She did not have faith in this program choice now, although if it was adopted, she hoped this district did not become another selling point on the list used by the publisher to market the program. She said if even the minimal process had been followed, such as including the PTA Council, there would be much less controversy now.

Mitchell pointed to the quality of California's Math Curriculum Frameworks, which emphasize the importance of mathematical preparation for all students living in the 21st century. She expressed support for the recommendation of the Committee and the Superintendent, and in moving forward with the strategic plan promise to focus on specific elementary math improvement goals. She described her domain as a trustee was to ensure high academic standards, aligned assessments, student success, and program evaluation. She noted that PAUSD's math curriculum and grade-level standards are on par with the best countries in the world, with an average limit of 15 topics per grade and mastery of 40 explicit skills per grade. She said the textbook is one of many tools our teachers use to provide balanced and comprehensive math instruction, and that teachers make the greatest difference in student learning. She regarded the talent and motivation of our teachers, and their expressed desire to develop our math program and their abilities, as PAUSD's secret sauce. Mitchell said that PAUSD students and teachers would succeed with any of the state-approved materials, adding that teachers spend 1,000 hours a year with our students and are in the best position to know the needs of our students and the strengths and weaknesses of our existing math materials. She regarded the implementation proposal as a rigorous training and communications plan with embedded evaluation measures, including student achievement, feedback from the teacher survey next February, and from the parent survey next April. She acknowledged that having disenfranchised some parents was a failure and that inputs and communications with parents could be improved.

Tom said he agreed the Board's primary role was to define roles and outcomes to be accomplished by staff, and staff were responsible for determining how to accomplish the Board's directive. Because this decision affected the education of children, failure was not an option. If this was approved now, there was still time for staff to do everything possible to ensure success, and to show parents what would be done to educate their students.

Townsend asked when the community would expect to know what supplemental materials would be adopted and when they would be available. Skelly said he would consult with staff and report back on this at the next Board meeting. He said he understood staff would need to win over those who did not support the program, and they were looking forward to this challenge.

Baten Caswell said she wanted to be clear she expected staff to perform and work to make the process better.

Townsend said she expected additional materials would be brought forward and that reports would be made to the Board about them. She also said she was concerned about taking risks with kids, because they only went through each grade once. Tom asked when any change was an experiment on children. Opening Hoover, or Spanish Immersion were experiments. Townsend said they were specifically identified as experiments, and this was not.

MOTION: Klausner moved to extend the meeting to 1:00 a.m. Tom seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

Klausner clarified her use of the term "experiment". She was referring to Scarsdale's own characterization of its decision to try Singapore Math in its district. Scarsdale was willing to make a big investment and be a pioneer in trying Singapore Math because they thought there could be a high reward. She also noted a number of local districts were successfully using *EDM*, so she did not view it as new or experimental; however, success was not guaranteed. She said she had heard guarantees that students leaving the District would not leave without mastery of concepts. Townsend said that in past adoptions, assurances had been given, but she was still concerned. Klausner said that there were now very rigorous grade level standards and assessments, which were not in place during past adoptions, so she did not believe this was an experiment. Baten Caswell said she had spoken to a number of parents who had been through an *EDM* implementation, and it was rocky.

MOTION: Tom moved to adopt the following K-5 materials: *California Everyday Mathematics* (grades Kindergarten –

MINUTES FOR REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 28, 2009

5 materials). Mitchell seconded. Motion carried 3-2. (Baten Caswell and Townsend voting No).

Action

"Project Lead the Way"
Memorandum of Understanding

Skelly said responses to questions posed at the prior meeting were presented in the report.

Board member comments included the number of teachers being trained, cost of the program, possible use of equal funding for other projects at Paly, source of funding, and the requirement of Board approval from Project Lead the Way.

MOTION: Baten Caswell moved to approve the *Project Lead the Way* Memorandum of Understanding, enabling staff to proceed with preparations to offer Introduction to Engineering - Digital Electronics - beginning with the first semester of the 2009-10 school year. Tom seconded. Motion carried 5-0.

Discussion

Authorization to Bid Summer
Maintenance Projects

Golton said this was an annual item for summer work items that could potentially cost over \$100,000.

Board member comments included history of summer project costs, how projects were prioritized, upcoming Joint Maintenance Agreement with the City of Palo Alto, and details of Paly tennis court improvements.

Discussion

Amendment to Agreement with
VBN Architects for Additional
Services

Golton said this was the closeout of the project cost increases for these projects.

Board member comments included completion date of AD-1 building work.

The Board agreed this item would return on the consent calendar at the next meeting.

Board Members'

Reports/Correspondence/Board
Operations/Recognition

Operations

Laurence said staff were working on Board policies and had received suggested revisions from CSBA, and staff were reviewing the updates. He said direction from the Board was now needed, as he would soon be leaving the District. He said CSBA wanted the Board to approve the entire policy at one time in order to save time. He said staff were working hard to finish the changes by Friday. They would then be sent to CSBA for final review, and then he suggested scheduling a Board study session to occur before he left in order to review the policies with the Board. Changes in the policies were marked clearly in the document. It was agreed that staff would proceed with this suggestion.

Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 1:00 a.m.

Secretary to the Board